



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| 09/196,301 | 11/19/98 | HESS | J SEA0820P0880 |

ROCKEY MILNAMOW & KATZ
TWO PRUDENTIAL PLAZA
SUITE 4700
180 NORTH STETSON AVENUE
CHICAGO IL 60601

QM02/1105

EXAMINER

BOMBERG, K

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3754

DATE MAILED:

11/05/99

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/196,301

Applicant(s)

HESS et al.

Examiner

Kenneth Bomberg

Group Art Unit

3754



☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Aug 23, 1999

☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire one month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☒ Claims 1-20 are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been
☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☐ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 3754

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restriction

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1-4, drawn to a dispensing fitment, classified in class 222, subclass 566.
 - II. Claims 5-11, drawn to dispensing fitment, classified in class 222, subclass 490.
 - III. Claims 12-16, drawn to a combination fitment and box container, classified in class 229, subclass 200.
 - IV. Claims 17-20, drawn to fitment and bag container, classified in class 222, subclass 105.

2. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions Group I and Group II are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions are specially adapted to connect to different types of containers and can not be used together.

3. Inventions of Group III and Group I are related as combination and subcombination.

Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed

Art Unit: 3754

does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed because the combination of Group III does not include details of the sub combination of Group I such as the flange and hollow projection. The subcombination has separate utility such as in a container having a cylindrical configuration.

4. Inventions of Groups I and IV, and Groups II and III are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions the subcombinations of Groups I and II are not useable with the respective combinations of Groups II and III. Specifically the subcombination of Group I is not adapted to be used with the combination bag of Group IV and the subcombination of Group II is not adapted to be used with the combination box of group III.

5. Inventions Group IV and Group II are related as combination and subcombination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as

Art Unit: 3754

claimed because the combination of Group IV does not include all of the limitations of Group II such as the fitment being adapted to be disposed in the bag opening. The subcombination has separate utility such as being mounted on the exterior of a hose opening.

6. Inventions Group III and Group IV are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions of the combination box package of Group III and the combination bag package of Group IV can not be used together and operate in a different manner.

7. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

8. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention:

Figs. 1-15;

Figs 16-19;

Figs 20-22.

Art Unit: 3754

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, no claims are generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

9. A telephone call was made to Paul M. Odell on November 1, 1999 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Art Unit: 3754

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

10. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(I).

Conclusion

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kenneth Bomberg whose telephone number is (703) 308-2179. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:30 AM - 6:00 PM. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.

The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 305-3588.



KENNETH BOMBERG
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 3754

K.B.
November 1, 1999